

**REMARKS**

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed March 9, 2005. Claims 1-30 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 1-29 were rejected, and Claim 30 was objected to. In order to expedite prosecution of this Application, Applicant amends Claim 14. Thus, Claims 1-30 remain pending in the Application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

In the Office Action, the following actions were taken or matters were raised:

**DRAWING OBJECTION**

The Examiner objected to the drawings because the Examiner stated that the drawings do not show the claimed feature of a "screen member connector." The Examiner is apparently referring to Claim 8 which recites "a screen member connector." Applicant respectfully submits that the "screen member connector" recited by Claim 8 clearly refers to "screen member connector 50" as recited in lines 1 and 2 of paragraph 0012 of Applicant's specification, and which is also clearly indicated in figure 2 of Applicant's specification. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that this objection be withdrawn.

**SPECIFICATION OBJECTIONS**

The Examiner objected to the title of the invention. In this regard, the Examiner stated that the present title is not descriptive. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The present invention as defined by the claims of the present Application is directed toward a portable computer system and method. For example, independent Claim 1 recites: "A portable computer system, comprising . . . ." Further, independent Claim 11 recites "[a] portable computer system, comprising," and independent Claim 16 recites "[a] method of manufacturing a portable computer system, comprising . . . ." Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the title of the present Application is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed and, accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that this objection be withdrawn.

**CLAIM OBJECTIONS**

The Examiner objected to Claim 14. Specifically, the Examiner states that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation of the claim. Specifically, the Examiner suggests that the phrase “the cover member” should read “the screen member.” Applicant has amended Claim 14 to amend the phrase “the cover member” to “the screen member” as suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection now be withdrawn.

**SECTION 102 REJECTIONS**

Claims 1-9, 11-13, 15-20, 22-27, 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,456,499 issued to Nakajima et al. (hereinafter “*Nakajima*”). Applicant respectfully traverse this rejection.

Of the rejected claims, Claims 1, 11, 16 and 22 are independent. Applicant respectfully submits that *Nakajima* does not disclose or even suggest each and every limitation of the independent Claims 1, 11, 16 and 22.

Independent Claim 1 recites “a bezel adapted to support a screen member.” The Examiner asserts that *Nakajima* discloses these limitations: “a bezel (9) adapted to support a screen member (8)” (Office Action, page 3). Applicant respectfully disagrees. *Nakajima* appears to disclose a portable computer 1 (e.g., a laptop computer) having a computer body 2 and a display unit 3 (*Nakajima*, column 4, lines 46-51, figure 1). The display unit 3 of *Nakajima* appears to include a display housing 6 as a casing for a liquid display module 7 where the housing 6 of *Nakajima* is formed of a display cover 8 and a display mask 9 (*Nakajima*, column 4, lines 56-63, figure 1). Thus, reference numeral 8 of *Nakajima* referred to by the Examiner is a “display cover” of the *Nakajima* device and not a “screen member” as recited by independent Claim 1 (emphasis added). Therefore, for at least this reason, *Nakajima* does not anticipate independent Claim 1.

Further, as discussed above, independent Claim 1 recites “a bezel adapted to support a screen member” (emphasis added). *Nakajima* appears to disclose that the mask 9 of

*Nakajima* referred to by the Examiner as corresponding to the “bezel” of Applicant’s independent Claim 1 is coupled to the display cover 8 of *Nakajima* and provides an opening (i.e., open portion 11) to expose the display screen 7a of *Nakajima* to a user (*Nakajima*, column 4, lines 59-65, figure 1). Thus, the mask 9 of *Nakajima*, asserted by the Examiner to correspond to Applicant’s recited “bezel” clearly does not support the display cover 8 of *Nakajima*. Accordingly, for at least this reason also, *Nakajima* does not anticipate independent Claim 1.

Independent Claim 11 recites “means for supporting a screen member” and “antenna means disposed at least partially between the supporting means and an interior surface of the screen member.” Regarding independent Claim 11, the Examiner states:

*Nakajima* further teaches a portable computer system (1), comprising: means for supporting a screen member (10); and an antenna means (12) disposed at least partially between the supporting means (10) and an interior surface of the screen member (8).

(Office Action, page 5). The Examiner appears to omit and/or duplicate reference numerals when referring to various components of the *Nakajima* device in the foregoing statement that correspond to Applicant’s limitations recited by independent Claim 11. For example, the Examiner first refers to reference numeral “10” of *Nakajima* (a wall of the support cover 8 of *Nakajima*, column 4, lines 60-62, figure 1) as corresponding to “a screen member” recited by Claim 10, but later refers to reference numeral “8” of *Nakajima* as the screen member. Further, the Examiner does not appear to identify any element of *Nakajima* corresponding to the “means for supporting a screen member” (emphasis added), but later appears to refer to reference numeral “10” of *Nakajima* as the supporting means. Accordingly, Applicant finds it difficult, if not impossible, to adequately address the Examiner’s rejection. Applicant requests the Examiner to clearly indicate which components of *Nakajima* the Examiner is relying on to teach the limitations of Claim 11 so that Applicant has an opportunity to address the Examiner’s concerns.

Notwithstanding the above, if the Examiner is asserting that reference numeral “10” of *Nakajima* corresponds to the “means for supporting” recited by Claim 11, and that

reference numeral “8” of *Nakajima* corresponds to the “screen member” recited by Claim 11, Applicant respectfully submits that such a purported disclosure of *Nakajima* does not anticipate independent Claim 11. For example, as discussed above, the display cover 8 of *Nakajima* is not “a screen member” as recited by independent Claim 11 (emphasis added). Further, *Nakajima* appears to disclose that the wall 10 of *Nakajima* is part of the display cover 8 of *Nakajima*. Accordingly, Applicant submits that, as such, the wall 10 of the display cover 8 of *Nakajima* does not support the display cover 8 of *Nakajima*. Moreover, at least because the wall 10 of *Nakajima* is part of the display cover 8 of *Nakajima*, the antenna means (referred to as “12” of *Nakajima* by the Examiner (which *Nakajima* discloses as an antenna substrate(column 5, lines 10-20))) is clearly not disposed “at least partially between the supporting means and an interior surface of the screen member” as recited by independent Claim 11. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicant submits that *Nakajima* does not anticipate independent Claim 11.

Independent Claim 16 recites “providing a screen member having an antenna disposed on an interior surface thereof” and “providing a bezel adapted to support the screen member, at least a portion of the antenna disposed between the bezel and the screen member,” and independent Claim 22 recites “a screen member,” “a display device disposed adjacent an interior surface of the screen member” and “an antenna disposed on the interior surface of the screen member.” For at least the reasons discussed above in connection with independent Claims 1 and 11, Applicants respectfully submit that *Nakajima* does not anticipate independent Claims 16 and 22. For example, Applicants respectfully submit that the “display cover 8” of *Nakajima* is not “a screen member” as recited by independent Claims 16 and 22 (emphasis added). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 16 and 22 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-9, 12, 13, 15, 17-20, 23-27 and 29 that depend respectively from independent Claims 1, 11, 16 and 22 also not anticipated by *Nakajima* at least because they incorporate the limitations of respective Claims 1, 11, 16 and 22 and also additional elements that further distinguish *Nakajima*. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits the rejection of Claims 2-9, 12, 13, 15, 17-20, 23-27 and 29 is improper and should be withdrawn.

**SECTION 103 REJECTIONS**

Claims 10, 21 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nakajima* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,809,689 issued to Chen (hereinafter "*Chen*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 10, 21 and 28 depend respectively from independent Claims 1, 16 and 22. For at least the reasons discussed above, Claims 1, 16 and 22 are in condition for allowance and, therefore, Claims 10, 21 and 28 that depend respectively therefrom are also in condition for allowance. Moreover, *Chen* does not appear to remedy at least the deficiencies of *Nakajima* discussed above. Therefore, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 10, 21 and 28 be withdrawn.

**ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER**


The Examiner objected to Claim 30 as being dependent on a rejected base claim (Claim 22). Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that Claim 30 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. However, as discussed above, independent Claim 22 is patentable over the cited reference. Therefore, Claim 30 which depends from independent Claim 22 is also patentable. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that this objection be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for immediate allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and full allowance of all pending claims.

No fee is believed due with this Response. If, however, Applicant has overlooked the need for any fee due with this Response, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayment associated with this Response to Deposit Account No. 08-2025 of Hewlett-Packard Company.

Respectfully submitted,

By:   
James L. Baudino  
Reg. No. 43,486

Date: June 9, 2005

Correspondence to:  
L.Joy Griebenow  
Hewlett-Packard Company  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P. O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400  
Tel. 970-898-3884